

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D C 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/866,451	05/25/2001	Mohammed Lokman Khan	1324.029	4119
23405	7590 07/17/2002			
HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI PC			EXAMINER	
5 COLUMBI. ALBANY, N			RAJGURU, UMAKANT K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1711	/-
			DATE MAILED: 07/17/2002	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·			 /
	TA-stanta Na	A-villaguet/a)	16-6
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Group Art Unit
—The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover shee	et beneath the co	rrespondence address
Period for Response			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE I MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	S SET TO EXPIRE 30	days month	FROM THE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) decreased in the period for response is specified above, such period shall, by Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response to the period for response to	ays, a response within the sta	tutory minimum of th	irty (30) days will be considered timely date of this communication .
Status			
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on			•
☐ This action is FINAL .			
Since this application is in condition for allowance exc accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle,			the merits is closed in
Disposition of Claims			
Claim(s)	is/are p	is/are pending in the application.	
Of the above claim(s)			
☐ Claim(s)		is/are a	llowed.
☐ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————		is/are r	ejected.
☐ Claim(s)		is/are o	bjected to.
Claim(s) /-21		are sub	eject to restriction or election
Application Papers		require	
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drav	wing Review, PTO-948.		
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is 🗆 approve	d 🗆 disapproved	l.
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob	jected to by the Examine	r.	
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	r.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)			
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies □ received. 	of the priority documents	s have been	
 □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Nu □ received in this national stage application from the 			·
*Certified copies not received:	·		
Attachment(s)			
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper	er No(s)	☐ Interview Sumn	nary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Office Acti n Summary

Part of Paper No.

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

☐ Other_____

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Art Unit: 1711

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-8, drawn to a process for modifying CNSL, classified in class
 426, subclass 236.
- II. Claim 9, drawn to a mixture of aldehydes, classified in class 568, subclass429.
- III. Claim 10, drawn to a method of converting CNSL aldehydes to an adhesive, classified in class 427, subclass 207.1+.
- IV. Claims 11-15, drawn to an adhesive composition, classified in class 524, subclass 700+.
- V. Claims 16-18, drawn to a method of forming a composite, classified in class 264, subclass 319.
- VI. Claims 19-21, drawn to a composite, classified in class 524, subclass 13.
- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by a materially different process such as oxidation or reduction.

Inventions I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of

operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation.

Inventions I and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions.

Inventions I and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation.

Inventions I and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions.

Inventions II and III are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a material for molding and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such

Art Unit: 1711

evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Inventions II and IV are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a material for molding and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence new of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions applicated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Inventions if and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, discrept functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions.

Inversions if and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of

operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions.

Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions.

Inventions III and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions.

Inventions III and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different effects.

Inventions IV and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions.

Inventions IV and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions.



Application/Control Number: 09/866,451

Art Unit: 1711

Inventions V and VI are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the process as claimed can be used to make a materially different product such as a molding from urea-formaldehyde resin composition.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

3. A telephone call was made to Attorney Candice J. clement on June 05, 2002 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election poing made.

UKK

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Umakant Rajguru whose telephone number is (703) 308-3224. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 Am to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on (703) 308-2462. The fax phone



Application/Control Number: 09/866,451

Art Unit: 1711

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Rajguru/LR July 12, 2002

James J. Seidleck
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700